

Meeting notes from the February 23, 2005 LRM Standards Committee

(NDOR Materials and Testing Conference Room)

Attendance:

Gail Knapp	City of Omaha, Planning
Larry Zink	GIS Steering Committee
Jim Langtry	Lancaster County Engineer's Office
Scott Richert	Lancaster County Assessor/Register of Deeds Office
Jim Koch	NE Dept. of Property Assessment and Taxation
Kori Jandara	Terrascan, Inc.

Agenda:

- 1) Review and approval of the meeting notes
- 2) Update of LB 565 – Land Information System Program Act
- 3) Should we propose a standard statewide Property Parcel ID?
 - a. Feedback from Cathy Lang, NPAT
- 4) Draft language on Data Format Standard.

a. **Draft Spatial Data Format Standard.** A broad range of state and regional applications require property parcel information. Many of these applications require the combining of data across jurisdictional boundaries. To facilitate these applications, the property parcel spatial (graphic) data should be either maintained in a manner that allows it to be readily integrated in a common geographic data format (i.e., shapefile) or be capable of being exported into a common geographic data format (i.e., shapefile).

5) Property Parcel Attributes

- a. Review of NPAT draft attribute needs
- b. Identifying attribute needs of other non-local government entities
- c. Need to identify standards/guidelines for other local government attribute needs?

6) Define Future Advisory Committee Focus

- a. Future Agenda Items
 - i. Ortho vs. PLSS??
- b. Outreach and Review Process

7) Next Adv. Cmte. Mtg. Date (Wed., Mar. 23rd, 1:00PM, NDOR Material and Testing Conference Room)

Meeting started at 1:01 pm

Introductions:

Everyone at the meeting introduced themselves.

1) Review and approval of the meeting notes:

Larry suggested that the heading in 5J be changed from “Attribute Data” to “Spatial Data. Scott indicated that he will make the changes.

2) Update of LB 565 – Land Information System Program Act:

Larry indicated that LB 565 was still in committee at the time and that most of the testifiers were in favor of the bill, but the fees could be an issue. No vote has been taken. Larry also reported on another GIS related bill LB 490. LB 490 is designed to regulate access to geographic computer data bases by governmental entities. LB 490 was put together rather hastily and probably will not go far.

3) Should propose a standard statewide Property Parcel ID?

Larry reported that he had contacted Cathy Lang and that she was in support of using a two digit county number in front of the existing PID. The question now is which two digit county system to use. The choices are the federal FIPS code, state license plate code or the state alpha code. There was much discussion on which code to use, and in the end, the committee was leaning toward implementing the federal FIPS code.

4) Draft language on Data Format Standard:

Larry offered the following paragraph for the data format standard:

A broad range of state and regional applications require property parcel information. Many of these applications require the combining of data across jurisdictional boundaries. To facilitate these applications, the property parcel spatial (graphic) data should be either maintained in a manner that allows it to be readily integrated in a common geographic data format (i.e., shapefile) or be capable of being exported into a common geographic data format (i.e., shapefile).

Everyone in attendance agreed on the contents of the data format standard paragraph.

5) Property Parcel Attributes:

Jim Koch went over the handouts and clarified which attributes the state is interested in retaining. Jim was going to go back to his office and try and resolve a little confusion regarding the difference between the PARCELNO and LOCATIONID. There was some discussion regarding the difference between the SITUS address and the OWNERS address. Jim Langtry reported on how Lancaster County is creating an address point coverage. There was also mention that JD Edwards is working on attributes the state requires and which will subsequently be asking the counties to provide to the state. There was also discussion of the county abstract, which is a requirement of the state. Scott offered to bring an example of the Lancaster County abstract for the next meeting. There was also discussion of what the state actually wants and what it uses. Currently the state only receives the sales files, but Jim indicated that in the future, that Cathy would

like to obtain all the county parcels and associated data. It was agreed upon that the committee needs to identify which attributes the JD Edwards team is investigating and if the State will require all the county parcels or just the sales file. The committee will come up with a revised list of attribute fields and any additional fields which maybe of interest to other agencies. Whichever way the state goes is how this committee will proceed. Larry posed the question, do we want to mandate counties to maintain their CAMA data digitally?

6) Define Future Advisory Committee Focus:

Larry indicated that the group needs to think about the Ortho vs. PLSS issue, creating/maintaining a street center line file and anything else a county would need to review or consider before they would receive money for GIS implementation.

Meeting Adjourned at 2:45 PM

Next Meeting:

Next Adv. Cmte. Mtg. Date (Wed., Mar. 23rd, 1:00PM, NDOR Material and Testing Conference Room)

Respectively Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Scott E. Richert".

Scott E Richert
Lancaster County Assessor/Register of Deeds